



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,530	02/27/2004	Scott Musson	BEAS-01374US1	6918
23910 7590 01/23/2008 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			EXAMINER ULRICH, NICHOLAS S	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/788,530

Applicant(s)

MUSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas S. Ulrich

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/16/2007, 1/10/2008.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2173

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-67 are pending
2. Claims 1-67 are rejected.
3. The IDS filed 11/16/2007 and 1/10/2008 has been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiigi et al. (US 2003/0014442 A1) and Bladow et al. (US 6115040).

In regard to claims 1, 50, and 67, Shiigi discloses a method and machine readable medium for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

providing for the representation of the GUI as a set of controls wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);

traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises:

associating a theme with a first control in the set of controls (*Paragraph 0082 lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked*);

rendering the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);

rendering any descendents of the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2*);

wherein any descendents of the first control can override the theme (*Paragraph 0051 lines 10-12*);

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered and wherein one of the set of controls can communicate with another of the set of controls as recited in the claims. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is entitled to see provide controls to the services*) and a set of controls can communicate with another set of controls (*Paragraph 1 lines 34-48 and Column 3 lines 8-21: The backplane unit provides communication between all components of the user interface system*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements and communication of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claim 18, Shiigi discloses a method for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

accepting a request (*Paragraph 0039 lines 3-4*);

mapping the request to a set of controls that represent the GUI, and wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);

traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises: associating a theme with a first control in the set of controls (*Paragraph 0082 lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked*)

rendering the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);

rendering any descendents of the first control according to the theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2*);

and wherein any descendents of the first control can override the theme (*Paragraph 0051 lines 10-12*).

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is*

*entitled to see provide controls to the services).* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claim 34, Shiigi discloses a method for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

providing for the representation of the GUI as a plurality of controls wherein the controls are organized in a logical hierarchy (*Paragraph 0014 lines 12-14, Paragraph 0016 and Paragraph 0056: Controls are organized in a template hierarchy which provides entitlement for each of the controls based on the tags specified within the template*);

traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises: associating a first theme with a first control in the plurality of controls (*Paragraph 0082 lines 4-6: The Object model is invoked*);

rendering the first control according to the first theme (*Paragraph 0050: step 1*);

associating a second theme with a second control in the plurality of controls (*Fig 2 element 32: template extension provides for the second set of controls to be added*);

rendering the second control according to the second theme (*Paragraph 0051: Step 2: the second control is determined from template extension*);

and wherein the second control is a descendant of the first control (*Fig 2 elements 30 and 32: element 30 is first control, element 32 is second control which depends from 30*).

While Shiigi teaches a representation of the GUI as a set of controls, they fail to show the each of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered. Bladow teaches validating a user and determining entitlements for services (*Column 3 lines 47-54: only those services available for a particular user will be displayed. The services listed that a user is entitled to see provide controls to the services*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shiigi and Bladow before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering of a GUI taught by Shiigi to include the entitlements of Bladow. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination as to block users from accessing controls that they do not have rights to use as suggested by Bladow (*Column 3 lines 65-66*).

In regard to claims 2, 22, 39, and 51, Shiigi discloses one of the set of controls can respond to an event raised by another of the set of controls (*Paragraph 0079*).

In regard to claims 3, 23, 40, and 52, Shiigi discloses a control can have an interchangeable persistence mechanism (*Fig 5 element 38*).

In regard to claims 4, 24, 41, and 53, Shiigi discloses a control can have an interchangeable rendering mechanism (*Fig 5 element 38*).

In regard to claims 5, 35, and 54, Shiigi discloses accepting a request (*Paragraph 0039 lines 3-4*).

In regard to claims 6, 19, 36, and 55, Shiigi discloses the request in a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request (*Paragraph 0039: lines 2-4 and Paragraph 0100 line 7*).

In regard to claims 7, 20, 37, and 56, Shiigi discloses the request originates from a web browser (*Paragraph 0039 lines 2-4*).

In regard to claims 8, 21, 38, and 57, Shiigi discloses generating a response (*Paragraph 0041 lines 1-3*).

In regard to claims 9, 25, 42, and 58, Shiigi discloses an control can represent one of: button, text field, menu, table, window, window control, title bar, pop-up window, check-box button, radio button, window frame, desktop, shell, head, body, header, footer, book, page, layout, placeholder, portlet and toggle button (*Paragraph 0055-0075*).



In regard to claims 10, 26, and 59, Shiigi discloses associating the theme with first control can occur when the first control is rendered (*Paragraph 0050: Master template defines the first controls when rendered*).

In regard to claims 11, 27, 43, and 60, Shiigi discloses the first control inherits the theme from a parent control (*Paragraph 0047/lines 11-13*).

In regard to claims 12, 28, 44, and 61, Shiigi discloses the theme specifies the appearance and/or functioning of an control in the GUI (*Paragraph 0016*).

In regard to claims 13, 29, 45, and 62, Shiigi discloses rendering the first control according to the theme can be accomplished in parallel with rendering of other controls (*Fig 3 step 1 elements 36 A and 36 C: Two controls have been rendered simultaneously with the master template*).

In regard to claims 14, 30, 46, and 63, Shiigi discloses the theme can be specified in whole or in part by a properties file (*Paragraph 0078 lines 1-4: template files have properties which define the theme of the page*).

In regard to claims 15, 31, 47, and 64, Shiigi discloses the properties file can include at least one of: 1 ) cascading style sheet; 2) Java Server Page; 3) Extensible Markup Language; 4) text; 5) Hypertext Markup Language; 6) Extensible Hypertext

Markup Language; 7) JavaScript; and 8) Flash MX (*Paragraph 0078 line 4: using HTML*).

In regard to claims 16, 32, 48, and 65, Shiigi discloses the properties file can specify at least one image (*Paragraph 0057*).

In regard to claims 17, 33, 49, and 66, Shiigi discloses the GUI is part of a portal on the World Wide Web (*Paragraph 0100*).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Bladow and Shiigi fail to disclose all the limitations of the independent claims. In particular applicant argues that the references fail to disclose "each control has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether the control is visible when rendered". The examiner disagrees.

The Bladow reference teaches that entitlement properties can be associated with user interface controls, in order to determine if the particular control should be presented and available to a user. For example, column 18, lines 39-50, Bladow describes the use of entitlement properties to determine which buttons are to be installed in a toolbar that is presented to the user. Bladow further teaches that entitlement properties are used to block users from accessing certain content; see Column 3 lines 65-66. With these teachings, one skilled in the art would recognize that

when creating a user interface, entitlement properties could be associated with any, if not all, of the controls on the user interface, in order to block users from accessing certain controls on the user interface.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas S. Ulrich whose telephone number is 571-270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Ulrich  
1/17/2008  
2173

/Kieu D. Vu/  
Kieu D. Vu  
Primary Examiner